

**REMARKS**

1. Claims 1-12 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Applicant is grateful for the indication that claim 10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of base claim 1 and intervening claim 9. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicant requests reexamination of the application and reconsideration of the rejection of the unallowed claims.

2. Rejection under §112. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 1 recites that the light pivots directly with in response to the pull of gravity as the vehicle leans. This element is an advantageous low cost design which eliminates the need for gyroscopes and adjustment devices. To help further clarify and distinguish claim 1, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite a connector, and that the attachment bracket is "rotatably secured to the connector." Also, Applicant has added additional language clarifying the direction of movement of the light with respect to the vehicle. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

3. Rejection under §102b: Claims 1 and 7-9 stand rejected over Tajima (Japanese Patent document JP 62096148). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Tajima appears to show a motorcycle vertical cutoff light which is indirectly adjusted in response to lean of a motorcycle by use of a gyroscope meter 7. Claim 1, as amended,

recites a light which pivots directly with in response to the pull of gravity as the vehicle leans. This element is clearly not taught or suggested in Tajima. Claims 7-9 depend from independent claim 1 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

4. Rejection under §103a. Claim 11 stands rejected over Tajima alone. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 11 depends from claim 1 which was allowable over Tajima for the reasons discussed above. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 8 and 12 stand rejected over Tajima in view of Funabashi (US Patent 4,356,536). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claims 2, 3, 5, 8 and 12 are dependent from claim 1 which was allowable over Tajima for the reasons discussed above. Nothing in Funabashi teaches or suggests a light which pivots directly with in response to the pull of gravity as the vehicle leans. Rather, Funabashi shows a light which can optionally be pivoted in response to an operator's use of an adjustment knob.

Moreover, Claim 8 has been amended to further distinguish over the art of record, reciting a bearing assembly, and three nuts at several positions with respect to the bearing assembly, connector and attachment bracket. This combination of elements is not taught or suggested in Funabashi or any of the other art of record. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.


Claims 4 and 6 stand rejected over Tajima in view of Funabashi, and further in view of Carlson (US Patent 1,543,150). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claims 4 and 6 depend from claim 1, which recites a light which pivots directly with in response to the pull of gravity as the vehicle leans. These elements are not taught or suggested in Tajima or Funabashi. Carlson discloses a light assembly which is adjustable in response to rotation of a steering wheel. Hence, Carlson does not cure the material deficiencies of Tajima and Funabashi. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

#### CONCLUSION

The additional citations made of record and not relied upon by the Examiner have been considered by the Applicant. None is seen, either alone or in combination, to teach or suggest the present invention. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of the claims and allowance of the application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Freeman Farrow et al



Robert Kelley Roth  
Attorney for Applicants  
Miller, Canfield, Paddock and Stone  
150 W. Jefferson, Suite 2500  
Detroit, MI 48226  
313-496-7568  
313-496-8454 (fax)  
[roth@millercanfield.com](mailto:roth@millercanfield.com)